

Technical Panel Evaluation: Habitat Restoration

Proposal # B146

Evaluation Criteria	Rank Description	Rank					Comments/ Clarifying Questions
		Low	Med. Low	Medium	Med. High	High	
Ecological/ Biological Benefits	High: Requirements for "Medium" rank are met. Project area provides an important link to adjacent existing or planned habitat areas. Project location is in an area of documented high use (or potential use) by priority species. Long term, naturally sustainable project benefits are expected. Without the project, existing, ongoing impacts to priority species are expected to be significant due to potentially high mortality in the area. ERP recognizes floodplain/marsh concerns in the area. Both aquatic and terrestrial species of concern would be addressed.			X			indirect information benefits
	Medium: Habitat restoration actions focus on use of natural processes and restored ecological function. Potential benefits to priority species and habitats are clear and quantifiable (e.g. acres of riparian or wetland habitat, miles of stream habitat, etc.). Project design and location are compatible with the hydrologic regime. Surrounding land use is compatible with project implementation. Project is consistent with ERP goals, and other CALFED objectives and/or other projects.						
	Low: Benefits to priority species and habitats are remote, dubious, or unclear. Site of project has low potential for increased fish or wildlife populations (priority species). Durability is questionable. Better alternatives to the project are likely. Project potentially conflicts with other projects and/or CALFED objectives (such as Levee Integrity).						
Technical Feasibility and Timing	High: Requirements for "Medium" rank are met. Project type is of proven feasibility and there are no obstacles to implementation. Project is ready for initiation. There are no remaining implementation issues. Project timing complements or enhances other phases/projects/programs. Environmental compliance needs are identified and already at least partially addressed. Project is already identified as the best alternative.					X	part of bigger effort
	Medium: Project is technically feasible and no major obstacles to implementation are expected. Proposed tasks are ready to be initiated. Environmental compliance needs are identified. Any outstanding implementation issues are identified and addressed. Alternatives are evaluated. Proposed schedule is compatible with CALFED process.						
	Low: Technical feasibility is questionable. Potentially major obstacles to implementation exist. Project tasks are not ready to be initiated. Alternatives not considered. Environmental documentation needs not identified. Proposed schedule is incompatible with CALFED process.						

Technical Panel Evaluation: Habitat Restoration

Proposal # \_\_\_\_\_

Evaluation Criteria	Rank Description	Rank					Comments/ Clarifying Questions
		Low	Med. Low	Medium	Med. High	High	
Monitoring and Data Collection	High: Requirements for "Medium" rank are met. Biological/ecological objectives clearly identified. Detailed monitoring plan already developed, with protocols and parameters identified. Monitoring integrated with other existing programs, if appropriate. Peer review process in place and review organizations identified. Monitoring and data collection information summarized in table.			X			
	Medium: Biological/ecological objectives identified, and approach to monitoring identified. An appropriate monitoring plan is described, or planned for development as part of the project. Specific monitoring parameters and protocols are identified as appropriate. Coordination with other programs cited. Data evaluation approach and review process addressed. Summary table for biological/ecological objectives provided.						
	Low: No biological/ecological objectives identified. Monitoring plan and approach unclear or missing. No monitoring parameters identified. Data evaluation approach unclear; no peer review of monitoring data.						
Local Involvement	High: Requirements for "Medium" rank are met. Documentation of local and landowner support provided. Public outreach activities have already occurred or are ongoing. Public outreach plan is in place. Access has been granted, and there are no 3rd party impacts.			X			
	Medium: Documentation of County notification attached. Other local groups & landowners identified and their level of support indicated. Plan for necessary public outreach described. Written permission for property access or use provided, as applicable. Potential 3rd party impacts identified.						
	Low: County not notified. Local groups or landowners not identified or not supportive. Access uncertain. 3rd party impacts possibly significant.						
Cost	High: Requirements for "Medium" rank are met. All requested cost information provided. Project is highly cost effective for the benefits expected, yet costs are realistic for the scope of work. Land ownership/easement issues have been addressed. Administrative costs and functions are clearly described, and administrative costs are a low percentage of overall cost.			X			Seems reasonable
	Medium: Requested cost information is clear and complete, broken down by task as appropriate. Quarterly budgets are provided. Project management costs are specified. Costs appear reasonable for the proposed level of effort. Applicant's resources are used to maximize cost effectiveness. Funding sources for O&M are identified. Administrative costs and functions clearly described.						

Technical Panel Evaluation: Habitat Restoration

Proposal # \_\_\_\_\_

Evaluation Criteria	Rank Description	Rank					Comments/ Clarifying Questions
		Low	Med. Low	Medium	Med. High	High	
	Low: Cost information incomplete or insufficiently detailed. Other resources not being used to maximize cost effectiveness. O&M funding sources not identified. Costs appear unreasonably high, or are insufficient, to accomplish the proposed scope of work. Administrative costs not included or unreasonably high.						
Cost Sharing	High: Requirements for "Medium" rank are met. At least half of the project cost is provided from other sources. Commitments from other funding sources are firm.						good tie-in with bigger project
	Medium: Other entities and/or applicant(s) sharing in the cost are identified. Some cost share, or in-kind services, are provided. Status of other funding commitments is indicated, and any relevant cost-sharing requirements disclosed.					X	
	Low: No cost share or in-kind services are provided.						
Applicant Qualifications	High: Requirements for "Medium" rank are met. Individuals or organizations have extensive, successful experience in completing similar types of projects. Any previous CALFED related contracts are being (or have been) successfully executed.						
	Medium: Organization of staff and participant organizations is clear. Responsibilities of individuals and organizations are identified for technical, administrative, and management roles. Biosketches are provided that indicate acceptable levels of expertise for the project. Potential conflicts of interest are disclosed.				X		
	Low: Organization of staff or participant organizations is not clear. Individual responsibilities not defined. Information is incomplete. Significant, or undisclosed, conflicts of interest exist.						